



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,113	06/24/2003	Keith G. Weinstock	PATH03-13	3509

23856 7590 03/30/2007  
OSCIENT PHARMACEUTICALS CORPORATION  
1000 WINTER STREET  
Suite 2200  
WALTHAM, MA 02451

EXAMINER
----------

ZEMAN, ROBERT A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1645

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/30/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/603,113

Applicant(s)

WEINSTOCK ET AL.

Examiner

Robert A. Zeman

Art Unit

1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9,10 and 14-28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12-22-2006.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1645

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election of Group I in the reply filed on 12-22-2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

The amendment filed on 12-22-2006 is acknowledged. Claims 1, 4-5, 8 and 11 have been amended. Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 9-10 and 14-28 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Claims 1-8 and 11-13 are currently under examination.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The Information Disclosure Statement filed on 12-22-2006 is acknowledged. An initialed copy is attached hereto.

### ***Specification***

The use of various trademarks has been noted in this application (see page 5 for example). It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

It should be noted that the cited occurrences of improper use are only exemplary and Applicant should review the entire specification to correct any other improper use of trademarks.

Art Unit: 1645

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner that might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1, 4-5, 8 and 11 are objected to because of the following informalities: said claims use an abbreviation for the genus, "*Candida*" without defining said abbreviation upon its first use. Moreover, genus and species names should be italicized. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The rejected claims are drawn to polynucleotides that encode a polypeptide capable of stimulating an immune response a mycobacterium. In other words, the immune response generated is to the mycobacterium, not just the polypeptide encoded by the polynucleotide.

Art Unit: 1645

The claims are drawn to a vast genus of polynucleotides wherein said polynucleotide comprises SEQ ID NO:2923 or encodes the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:17026 wherein said polynucleotides must be able to treat or prevent a *Candida albicans* infection (i.e. induce an immune response to *Candida albicans*). To fulfill the written description requirements set forth under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, the specification must describe at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, or alternatively describe a representative member of the claimed genus, which shares a particularly defining feature common to at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, which would enable the skilled artisan to immediately recognize and distinguish its members from others, so as to reasonably convey to the skilled artisan that Applicant has possession the claimed invention. To adequately describe the genus of polynucleotides (as described above) that stimulate an immune response to a *Candida albicans*, Applicant must adequately describe the antigenic determinants (immunoepitopes) that elicit an immune response directed against *Candida albicans* not just those determinants that would elicit an immune response to the polypeptide encoded by said polynucleotide or the polynucleotide itself. A given polypeptide/polynucleotide can be immunogenic but not induce an immune response directed against *Candida albicans*.

However, the specification does not disclose distinguishing and identifying features of a representative number of members of the genus of polynucleotides (or the polypeptides they encode) to which the claims are drawn, such as a correlation between the structure of the immunoepitope and its recited function (to elicit an immune response directed against a *Candida albicans*), so that the skilled artisan could immediately envision, or recognize at least a substantial number of members of the claimed genus of polynucleotides. Moreover, the

Art Unit: 1645

specification fails to disclose which amino acid residues of the encoded polypeptides are essential to the function of the immunoepitope or which amino acids might be replaced or deleted so that the resultant immunoepitope retains the activity of its parent, or by which other amino acids the essential amino acids might be replaced so that the resultant immunoepitope retains the activity of its parent. Therefore, since the specification fails to adequately describe at least a substantial number of members of the genus of immunoepitopes to which the claims are based; the specification fails to adequately describe at least a substantial number of members of the claimed genus of polynucleotides capable of stimulating an immune response to a *Candida albicans*.

MPEP § 2163.02 states, “[a]n objective standard for determining compliance with the written description requirement is, ‘does the description clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that he or she invented what is claimed’ ”. The courts have decided:

The purpose of the “written description” requirement is broader than to merely explain how to “make and use”; the applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the “written description” inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.

See *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Federal Circuit, 1991). Furthermore, the written description provision of 35 USC § 112 is severable from its enablement provision; and adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

*The Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112,*

Art Unit: 1645

*paragraph 1, "Written Description" Requirement* (66 FR 1099-1111, January 5, 2001) state, "[p]ossession may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing the invention was 'ready for patenting' such as by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention" (*Id.* at 1104). Moreover, because the claims encompass a genus of variant species, an adequate written description of the claimed invention must include sufficient description of at least a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. However, factual evidence of an actual reduction to practice has not been disclosed by Applicant in the specification; nor has Applicant shown the invention was "ready for patenting" by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete; nor has Applicant described distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant were in possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

The *Guidelines* further state, "[f]or inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus which embraces widely variant species *cannot* be achieved by disclosing only one species within the genus" (*Id.* at 1106); accordingly, it follows that an adequate written description of a genus cannot be achieved in the absence of a disclosure of at least one species within the genus.

As evidenced by Greenspan et al. (*Nature Biotechnology* 7: 936-937, 1999), defining epitopes is not as easy as it seems. Greenspan et al. recommends defining an epitope by the

Art Unit: 1645

structural characterization of the molecular interface between the antigen and the antibody is necessary to define an “epitope” (page 937, column 2). According to Greenspan et al., an epitope will include residues that make contacts with a ligand, here the antibody, but are energetically neutral, or even destabilizing to binding. Furthermore, an epitope will not include any residue not contacted by the antibody, even though substitution of such a residue might profoundly affect binding. Accordingly, it follows that the immunoepitopes that can elicit an immune response to a given pathogen can only be identified empirically. Therefore, absent a detailed and particular description of a representative number, or at least a substantial number of the members of the genus of immunoepitopes, the skilled artisan could not immediately recognize or distinguish members of the claimed genus of immunogenic compositions capable of stimulating an immune response in an animal to *Candida albicans* (as opposed to the polypeptide encoded by the polynucleotide or the polynucleotide itself) Therefore, because the art is unpredictable, in accordance with the *Guidelines*, the description of immunoepitopes (antigenic determinants) is not deemed representative of the genus of immunogenic compositions to which the claims refer. Finally, it should be noted that the specification only discloses the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:17026 being encoded by the polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO:2923. The sequences satisfy the written description requirements, however claim 1 encompasses any and all polypeptides (i.e. fragments) of the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:17206. None of the polypeptides or the nucleic acids encoding them have been disclosed in the specification and hence they do not satisfy the written description requirements.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with



Art Unit: 1645

the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The rejected claims are drawn to polynucleotides that encode a polypeptide capable of stimulating an immune response a mycobacterium wherein said polynucleotide comprises SEQ ID NO:2923 or encodes the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:17026. To be a prophylactic composition, the composition must elicit protective immunity, demonstrable by pathogen challenge experiments in a reasonable model system. However, Applicant has failed to demonstrate any polynucleotides that are capable of eliciting the claimed immune response (an immune response directed against a *Candida albicans* itself not just the polypeptide/polynucleotide). The specification fails to disclose any infectious organisms capable of inducing a protective immune response against a given disease. Additionally, Applicant has failed to demonstrate any given "antigenic determinant" is capable of eliciting a protective/therapeutic immune response against *Candida albicans*.

While the skill in the art of immunology is high, to date, prediction of a specific immune response for any given composition in any given animal is quite unpredictable. Moreover, protein chemistry is probably one of the most unpredictable areas of biotechnology. Consequently, the effects of sequence dissimilarities upon protein structure and function cannot be predicted. Bowie et al (Science, 1990, 257:1306-1310) teach that an amino acid sequence encodes a message that determines the shape and function of a protein and that it is the ability of these proteins to fold into unique three-dimensional structures that allows them to function, carry out the instructions of the genome **and form**

Art Unit: 1645

**immunoepitopes.** Bowie et al. further teach that the problem of predicting protein structure from sequence data and in turn utilizing predicted structural determinations to ascertain functional aspects of the protein is extremely complex. (column 1, page 1306). Bowie et al further teach that while it is known that many amino acid substitutions are possible in any given protein, the position within the protein's sequence where such amino acid substitutions can be made with a reasonable expectation of maintaining function are limited. Certain positions in the sequence are critical to the three dimensional structure/function relationship and these regions can tolerate only conservative substitutions or no substitutions (column 2, page 1306). Additionally, as evidenced by Greenspan et al. (*Nature Biotechnology* 7: 936-937, 1999), defining epitopes is not as easy as it seems. Greenspan et al. recommends defining an epitope by the structural characterization of the molecular interface between the antigen and the antibody is necessary to define an "epitope" (page 937, column 2). According to Greenspan et al., an epitope will include residues that make contacts with a ligand, here the antibody, but are energetically neutral, or even destabilizing to binding. Furthermore, an epitope will not include any residue not contacted by the antibody, even though substitution of such a residue might profoundly affect binding. Accordingly, it follows that the immunoepitopes that can elicit an immune response to a given pathogen can only be identified empirically. This constitutes undue experimentation. Therefore, given the lack of success in the art, the lack of working examples commensurate in scope to the claimed invention and the unpredictability of the generation of directed immune response, the specification, as filed, does not provide enablement for polynucleotides encoding for polypeptides capable of stimulating an immune response to a mycobacterium. Moreover, it should be noted that the rejected claims read on DNA vaccines but the specification is silent as to what nucleic acids would encode polypeptides that

Art Unit: 1645

would elicit a protective immune response against mycobacterium. Additionally, even though one would expect the polypeptide encoded by SEQ ID NO:2923 (i.e. the polypeptide with the sequence of SEQ ID NO:17026) to elicit an immune response one would not be able to predict whether said immune response would be directed to a *Candida albicans* or whether a given immune response would be protective/therapeutic. One would be equally unable to predict whether polypeptides comprising fragments of SEQ ID NO:17026 would elicit a protective/therapeutic immune response. Hence, with regard to the use of vaccines, the specification is not enabling.

Claims 3-4 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicants broadly claim a cell (transgenic) containing a polynucleotide with the sequence of SEQ ID NO:2923 or encoding the polypeptide with the sequence of SEQ ID NO:17026 within an expression vector and a method for producing the said polypeptide by culturing the transgenic cell. These claims read on a cell within a transgenic animal given that the term "isolated" is not denoted in describing the transgenic cell. The breadth of the claim reads on the implementation of the transgenic cell in both *in vitro* and *in vivo* assays.

The state of the art at the time of filing was such that one of skill could not predict the phenotype of transgenics. For example, Overbeek (1994, "Factors affecting transgenic animal production," Transgenic animal technology, pages 96-98) taught that within one litter of

Art Unit: 1645

transgenic mice, considerable variation in the level of transgene expression occurs between founder animals and causes different phenotypes (page 96, last paragraph). The art of transgenic animals has for many years stated that the unpredictability lies, in part, with the site or sites of transgene integration into the target genome and that "the position effect" as well as unidentified control elements are recognized to cause aberrant expression of a transgene (Wall, 1996 *Theriogenology*, Vol. 45, pp. 57-68). The elements of the particular construct used to make transgenic animals are also held to be critical, and they must be designed case by case without general rules to obtain good expression of a transgene; e.g., specific promoters, presence or absence of introns, etc. (Houdebine, 1994, *J. Biotech.* Vol. 34, pages 269-287, specifically page 281). Furthermore, transgenic animals are regarded to have within their cells, cellular mechanisms that prevent expression of the transgene, such as methylation or deletion from the genome (Kappell, 1992, *Current Opinions in Biotechnology*, Vol. 3, pp. 548-553).

Well-regulated transgene expression is not frequently achieved because of poor levels or the complete absence of expression or leaky expression in non-target tissues (Cameron, 1997, *Molec. Biol.* 7, pages 253-265, specifically page 256, col. 1 -2, bridg. parag.). Factors influencing low expression, or the lack thereof, are not affected by copy number and such effects are seen in lines of transgenic mice made with the same construct (Cameron, 1997, *Molec. Biol.* 7, page 256, lines 3-9). With regard to the importance of promoter selection, Niemann (1997) states that transgenic pigs made with different promoters regulating expression of a growth hormone gene give disparate phenotypes - one deleterious to the pig, the other compatible with pig health (Niemann, 1997, *Transg. Res.* 7, pages 73-75, specifically page 73, col. 2, parag. 2, line 12 to page 73, col. 1, line 4).

Art Unit: 1645

Examples in the literature aptly demonstrate that even closely related species carrying the same transgene construct can exhibit widely varying phenotypes. Mullins (1993, Hypertension, Vol. 22, pp. 630-633) states that not all animals express a transgene sufficiently to provide a model for a disease as the integration of a transgene into different species of animal has been reported to give divergent phenotypes. For example, several animal models of human diseases have relied on transgenic rats when the development of mouse models was not feasible. Mullins (1990, Nature, Vol. 344, 541-544) produced outbred Sprague-Dawley x WKY rats with hypertension caused by expression of a mouse *Ren-2* renin transgene. Hammer (1990, Cell, Vol. 63, 1099-1112) describes spontaneous inflammatory disease in inbred Fischer and Lewis rats expressing human class I major histocompatibility allele HLA-B27 and human  $\beta_2$ -microglobulin transgenes. Both investigations were preceded by the failure to develop human disease-like symptoms in transgenic mice expressing the same transgenes that successfully caused the desired symptoms in transgenic rats (Mullins, 1989, EMBO J., vol. 8, pages 4065-4072; Taurog, 1988, Jour. Immunol., Vol. 141, pages 4020-4023). Mullins (1996, J. Clin. Invest. Vol. 98, pages S37-S40) disclose that the use of non-murine species for transgenesis will continue to reflect the suitability of a particular species for the specific questions being addressed, bearing in mind that a given construct may react very differently from one species to another. Thus, at the time of filing, the phenotype of a transgenic cell contained within any animal was unpredictable and could not be prepared for any species. Applicants can obviate the instant rejection by amending the claims to recite the term "isolated" before the recitation, "cell".

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1645

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 5 are rendered vague and indefinite by the use of the phrase “nucleic acid comprising a nucleotide sequence...”. It is unclear what is meant by said phrase as a sequence is abstraction. It is suggested that the phrase “nucleic acid having a sequence comprising the sequence of SEQ ID NO:X” or comparable language be used instead.

Claim 5 is rendered vague and indefinite by the use of the phrase “encoding a *C. albicans* polypeptide or a fragment thereof wherein said nucleic acid is SEQ ID NO:2923”. It unclear how a polynucleotide with a finite sequence can encode for multiple polypeptides and fragments. It should be noted that the use of the term “a” suggests that the claimed polynucleotide encodes multiple polypeptides.

Claim 13 is rendered vague and indefinite by the use of the term “active ingredients”. It is unclear what is encompassed by said term as it is not definitively defined in the specification. What “activity” is applicant referring to? How is it measured? As written, it is impossible to determine the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1645

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stratagene Catalog (1991).

The Stratagene catalog discloses a random primer set that consists of every possible 9-mer primers (see page 66). These would necessarily include those nucleic acids encoding a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:17026 (which can be as small as a dimer).

### *Conclusion*

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert A. Zeman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0866.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Thursday, 7am -5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Siew can be reached on (571) 272-0787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Art Unit: 1645

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert A. Zeman". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial "R" and "Z".

**ROBERT A. ZEMAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

March 27, 2007